From: Windom, John H.
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 1:47 PM
To: Blackburn, Scott R.; Bowman, Thomas
Cc: Zenooz, Ashwini; Short, John (VACO)
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: VA EHR

Mr. Blackburn,
Not sure where Mr. Sherman is going with his comments but our language in the contract is consistent with the requirements or our Clinicians , various external reviews and the Mitre report. Mr. Sherman is seeking specificity in the interoperability realm that simply does not exist today and is evolving even as I type. We have provisions in the EHR contract to insert technology as we, the VA, as well as to incorporate evolving technology and standards. The DVP acquisition is our bridge to the use of APIs (gateways), FHIR, etc. We have modified our interoperability language (below) based on the Mitre and the many external reviews to give us the utmost flexibility over the 10-year life of this contract. The Secretary personally halted the recent phone call to stop Marc Sherman, et. Al's parade of national interoperability objectives as not feasible at this juncture "anywhere," but included as part of our overall interoperability strategy that includes the DVP acquisition/strategy. We are committed to establishing the interoperability test bed/sandbox at IOC to solidify our interoperability objectives prior to full deployment to the enterprise. In addition, I believe Mr. Sherman meant to highlight section 5.5.1 which speaks to the data domains that were called into question and their inclusion in the contract. They are clearly in the contract as captured below. Mr. Sherman does not understand the culture of VA or the federal government. We have an incremental/iterative change management strategy that will culminate in a successful EHR Modernization effort. He appears to be more of a "big bang" theory guy. The problem is, we must continue to deliver uninterrupted and quality care to our Veterans during the transformation within the parameters of the law and other regulations/policies (e.g. cybersecurity, cloud, etc.) bounding our integration/implementation strategies. Our existing language is sound and appropriately balances change management risks, future insertion of technology, innovation opportunities, standards development, etc. without artificially inflating the cost of the contract through the incorporation of excess specificity that never materializes in practice. Through the Initial Operating Capabilities (IOC) process and the judicious issuance of task orders, we will have the ability to change course direction as appropriate without excess risk to the taxpayers or our overall success. Mr. Sherman continues to fail to recognize that it is Program Management Oversight (PMO) and VA commitment to change management that will drive our success in these areas, not more words in the contract.
V/r,
John

IDIQ PWS 5.5.1: Workflow Development and Normalization:

j) The Contractor shall enable configuration of the application that supports external community data without requiring the clinician to go to special screens to see and use reconciled external